DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 075 548 UD 013 539

AUTHOR	Hittleman, Daniel R.
TITLE	Final Report of an Evaluation of the Corrective Reading Services in Non Public Schools, July 1972.
INSTITUTION	Teaching and Learning Research Corp., New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Jul 72
NOTE	51p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Compensatory Education Programs; *Corrective Reading; Elementary Education; Federal Aid; Federal Programs; Individualized Instruction; Parochial Schools; *Private Schools; *Program Evaluation; Reading Programs; Secondary Education; Teacher Placement; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; *New York City

ABSTRACT

The New York City Board of Education under Title I of the Elementary Secondary Education Act has instituted a program of special corrective reading services for disadvantaged children in nonpublic schools. Under the program, the Board of Education through its Division of Funded Programs, Office of ESEA Title I Programs for the Non-public Schools, recruits, selects, trains, and assigns licensed teachers to eligible non-public schools in order to improve the reading achievement of children who have been identified as having reading problems. During the 1971-72 school year, the program is in its sixth full year of operation, encompasses 172 schools serving 8297 children, and is staffed by 41 full-time and 120 part-time corrective reading teachers. The Corrective Reading Services Program was developed to provide elementary and secondary school students with three basic activities in small group settings: (a) verbal discussions geared to develop and enrich a basic meaning vocabulary; (b) word analysis activities geared to develop independence in decoding; and, (c) guided and independent reading activities geared to develop ability to comprehend written materials. This final report includes an evaluation of the program's implementation, an assessment of the program's effectiveness, and an evaluation of the program by the professional staff and parents who participated in the program. (Author/JM)

ED 075548

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FUNCTION NO. 920642

FINAL REPORT

AN EVALUATION OF THE CORRECTIVE READING SERVICES IN NON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

JULY, 1972

Evaluation of a New York City school district project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1971-72 school year.

TEACHING & LEARNING RESEARCH CORP.

91-31 QUEENS BOULEVARD/SUITE 611/ELMHURST, NEW YORK 11373/ 212-478-4340

UD 013539

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The information in this study could not have been compiled without the cooperation of a number of persons. In the Office of ESEA Title I Programs of The Board of Education, the assistance of Lawrence F. Larkin, Director of the Non-public School Unit, and Bernadette Pepin, Coordinator of Corrective Reading Services to Non public Schools was invaluable.

Appreciation is also extended to all the Field Supervisors, Corrective Reading Teachers, Building Principals, Classroom Teachers, Parents and Students who took time to complete the questionnaires and offer constructive suggestions.

EVALUATION STAFF

EVALUATION DIRECTOR:	Alan J. Simon
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:	Daniel R. Hittleman
RESEARCH ASSOCIATE:	Simone Sternberg

Table of Contents

	Page
List of Tables	i
Executive Summary	ii
Program Description	1
Program Objectives	2
Evaluation Objectives	2
Evaluation Procedures	3
General Evaluation of Program Implementation	5
School Facilities	5
Instructional Program	6
Evaluation and Follow-up	10
Pupil Evaluation	14
Evaluation of Pupil Gains	14
Evaluation of Secondary School Pupils' Aspirations	16
Staff Evaluation of the Program	19
Corrective Reading Teachers	19
Field Supervisors	21
Classroom Teachers	23
Principals	24
Parents' Reaction to Program	26
Cost Effectiveness	26
Summary, Findings, and Recommendations	27
Appendix A School Sample for Non-public Schools Corrective Reading Program	32
Appendix B Guidelines for Observation of Corrective Reading Program	33
Appendix C Field Supervisors' Questionnaire	34
Appendix D Corrective Reading Teachers' Questionnaire	36
Appendix E Principals' Questionnaire	38
Appendix F Classroom Teachers' Questionnaire	39
Appendix G Parents' Letter and Questionnaire	40
Appendix H Students' Questionnaire	43

List of Tables

		Page
1.	Schools selected for Site Visits by District and Code	3
2.	Tests of Significance of Gains in Silent Reading	14
3.	Distribution of Reported Gains by Grade Level Units on the MAT	15
3a.	Predicted vs. Actual Post-test Gains on the MAT	15
4.	Test of Significance of Gains in Oral Reading	15
4a.	Predicted vs. Actual Post-test Gains on the Gray Oral Reading Paragraphs	16
4b.	Predicted vs. Actual Post-test Gains on the Iowa Silent Reading Tests	16
5.	Student Aspiration	17
6.	Occupational Aspirations of Students	18
7.	Evaluation of the Program - Corrective Reading Teachers	19
8.	Evaluation of the Program - Classroom Teachers	23
9.	Evaluation of Program - Principals	25
10.	Evaluation of the Program - Parents	26

Executive Summary

The New York City Board of Education under the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 (Title I) has instituted a program of special corrective reading services for disadvantaged children in non public schools. The program is organized so that small groups of children meet with teachers specially recruited and trained to diagnose and instruct students with reading problems. The program is in its sixth full year of operation.

The major objectives of the program were to increase the students' word attack and oral reading skills, to increase the students' skills of word meaning and paragraph comprehension and to increase the students' educational aspirations.

Formal evaluation of the 1971-72 school year program began in January and continued through May, the evaluation concentrated on the degree to which the above objectives were met. Evaluation procedures included site visits to a stratified sample of 27 schools selected from all the schools participating in the program, an analysis of the oral and silent reading test scores for the pupils in the sample schools; and an analysis of responses by the professional staff and parents to questionnaires designed to measure their reactions to the program. A questionnaire to assess secondary school pupils' educational aspirations was also administered.

This final report is limited to the operation of the corrective reading program during the 1971-72 school year. It includes an evaluation of the program's implementation, an assessment of the program's effectiveness, and an evaluation of the program by the professional staff and parents who participated in the program.

An analysis of the data yielded the following findings.

1. On site observation of the program in progress revealed that:

a) The children generally were receiving instruction in adequate facilities.

b) All of the schools had other special service staff but there was no evidence of formal procedures for the exchange of information between the corrective teacher and the other special staff although they both serviced children in common.

c) The teachers generally had good rapport with the children.

d) The teachers, except for a few instances, relied in their instruction upon the commercial material provided for them by the central office.

e) The teachers espoused a level of individualization of instruction which was not evident.

f) Aside from the general long term plans filed by the corrective reading teacher with the Coordinator, the corrective teachers and the host administrators had limited short term goals for the children in the program.

g) The corrective teachers showed no consistency in their ability to diagnose reading difficulties except on a gross scale and to prescribe specific instruction for remediation.

h) Although the corrective teachers prepared formal evaluation reports for the principals of the host schools, there was little evidence that these reports were put to use by the schools to influence the regular instruction of the pupils.

i) The corrective teachers were well supervised by the Field Supervisors and the supervision was positively received by the reading teachers. There was, however, some confusion on the part of the building principals over their role in the supervision of the corrective teachers, even though they were provided with written guidelines by the Program Coordinator. (See Item 7 below.)

2. Analysis of the reading test scores on both the Metropolitan Achievement test and the Gray Oral Reading Paragraphs indicated substantial mean gain in the areas under study. For each instance the gains were significant at the .01 level.

3. Analysis of the reading scores on the Iowa Silent Reading tests indicated that actual post-test mean scores were significantly greater than the predicted mean scores at the .001 level.

4. Analysis of the secondary students educational aspiration revealed significant differences between their desired final educational level and their expected final educational level. It was noted that the students' original educational aspirations were quite high.

5. Analysis of the evaluation of the program by the corrective reading teachers revealed positive reactions toward the program. Strong points in their opinion were their rapport with the children and their preparation of instructional lessons and material.

6. Analysis of the evaluation of the program by the field supervisors revealed a general understanding of the program and little indication of changes which might be instituted.

7. Analysis of the evaluation of the program by the classroom teachers revealed very positive attitudes towards the program.

8. Analysis of the evaluation of the program by the principals revealed favorable attitudes toward the program; however, some confusion was indicated over their role in the supervision of the corrective teachers and the extent to which they, the principals can be involved in decentralizing the administration of certain aspects of the program.

9. Parents responses indicated interest in the program and the belief that their children were benefiting from the program. There was some indication that the parents wished a formal report of their children's progress.

The following recommendations are made not so much to change the basic format of the Corrective Services, but to make these services more sensitive to the diverse needs found among the schools receiving the service.

1. Host schools should provide adequate facilities. If need be, some of the funds allocated for that school should be directed to improving the condition under which Title I personnel work.

2. The qualifications for corrective reading teachers should include completed graduate study in the specialized area of remedial reading and at least two years of classroom teaching experience.

Where existing tenured teachers do not meet these requirements, all efforts should be made to have them undertake such specialized study.

3. In-service training for all corrective teachers should include application of the newer psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic insights into the teaching of reading as well as the teaching of English to speakers of other languages.

4. A true diagnostic oral reading instrument should be introduced through the above in-service training.

5. Individual schools and the Title I staff should undertake the development of written devices for the exchange of information among the corrective teachers, the classroom teachers and the parents.

6. Individual schools in conjunction with the Field Supervisors and corrective teachers should be encouraged to establish local guidelines for a) the selection, teaching, and evaluation of students, b) the selection of materials used in the teaching of these students, c) the selection and supervision of the corrective reading teachers, and d) the expansion of the corrective teachers' or field supervisors' role to include the direct support of the classroom teachers who have children eligible for the program. All guidelines should be approved by the Director of the Office of Title I ESEA Programs to Non Public Schools.

CORRECTIVE READING SERVICES

IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The New York City Board of Education under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I) has instituted a program of special corrective reading services for disadvantaged children in nonpublic schools. Under the program, the Board of Education through its Division of Funded Programs office of ESEA Title I Programs for the Non-public Schools, recruits, selects, trains and assigns licensed teachers to eligible non-public schools in order to improve the reading achievement of children who have been identified as having reading problems.

Children in grades two to twelve who were more than one standard deviation below the norm on a standardized reading test were recommended by the staff of their respective schools for corrective reading. The corrective reading teacher screened and selected the children to participate in the program.

During the 1971-72 school year, the program is in its sixth full year of operation and encompasses 172 schools serving 8297 children and is staffed by 41 full-time and 120 part-time corrective reading teachers. The corrective teachers are supervised by 10 Field Supervisors and one Director.

The Corrective Reading Services Program was developed to provide early elementary, later elementary and secondary school students with three basic activities in small group settings:

a) Verbal discussions geared to develop and enrich a basic meaning vocabulary.

b) Word analysis activities geared to develop independence in decoding.

c) Guided and independent reading activities geared to develop ability to comprehend written materials.

The activities of the participants are generally based on specific needs in order to correct diagnosed weaknesses. Pupils are scheduled for individual conferences with the teacher during the small sessions. Later elementary school students' activities put greater emphasis on areas of general comprehension and specific study skills. The emphasis of the secondary students' activities is to develop skills in the content areas and to foster independence in use of word-attack and comprehension skills.

A typical class session consists of the Corrective Reading teacher meeting with ten children for one hour, two times a week. Each child has an individual folder containing a notebook in which he records answers to his work and the teacher records assignments and/or notation about his progress. Other materials kept in the folder are special materials geared to the child's needs, samples of complete work, and possibly a book for independent reading.

Approximately one-third of a period is spent on group reading and/or language arts activities with the remainder devoted to individually assigned work. During this time, the corrective reading teacher has individual confer-

ences with the children to ascertain progress and make appropriate assignments.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The major objectives of the program are:

A. To increase the average word attack and oral reading skills of early elementary and later elementary pupils by at least .6 grade equivalent units on Gray's Standardized Oral Reading Paragraph Test.

B. To increase the early elementary and later elementary participants' skills of word meaning and paragraph comprehension by a mean of at least .6 grade equivalent units as measured by the Metropolitan Reading Test.

C. To increase the secondary participants' average performance in comprehension, word meaning and literature appreciation by 1.0 grade equivalent units as measured by the Iowa Silent Reading Test.

D. To increase the educational aspirations of the participants such that there is a statistically significant increase in years of expected school attendance.

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

The evaluation undertook to assess whether the program objectives were in fact achieved.

The major evaluation objectives were:

A. To assess whether there is a mean of .6 grade equivalent increase in word attack and oral reading skills for early elementary, and later elementary participants as measured by Gray's Standardized Oral Reading Paragraph Test.

B. To assess whether the early and later elementary participants increase their word meaning and comprehension skills by an average of at least .6 grade equivalent units as measured by the Metropolitan Reading Test.

C. To assess whether there is a 1.0 mean grade equivalent unit increase for secondary level students on comprehension, word meaning and literature appreciation as measured by the Iowa Silent Reading Test.

D. To assess whether there is a statistically significant increase in the educational aspirations of the program participants as measured by the number of years they intend to stay in school.

Although not a specific objective of the program, the opinions of the corrective reading teachers, classroom teachers, principals, and parents regarding the program were assessed through questionnaires.

Formal evaluation of the 1971-72 school year began in early January 1972 with a series of site visits. The evaluation was concluded at the end of May 1972. Each sample school was visited twice. This final report is limited to the operations of the corrective reading program during the 1971-72 school year. It includes an evaluation of the program's implementation, an assessment of the program's effectiveness, and an evaluation of the program by the professional staff and parents who participated in the program.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

In order to evaluate the program a stratified sample of 27 schools proportionally representing the schools in each code group was selected for site visits. Table I contains a break down of the schools by school district and code. Appendix A lists the actual schools in the sample.

Table I

Schools selected for site visits by district and code

(b) Code	f	N=27	(a) Districts
1	13		1(2), 2(2), 3(1), 4(1), 5(1), 6(1) 7(1), 8(1), 10(1), 12(1), 31(1)
2	6		13(1), 14(1), 15(1), 16(1), 19(1), 28(1)
3	5		1(1), 9(1),20(2),21(1),
4	2		15(1), 24(1)
5	0		
6	0		
7	1		14(1)

(a) Number in parentheses refers to number of schools selected in each district.

(b) Code designations:

1 - Catholic Schools, Archdiocese of New York
2 - Catholic Schools, Diocese of Brooklyn
3 - Hebrew Day Schools and Yeshivas
4 - Greek Orthodox Schools
5 - Lutheran Schools
6 - Episcopal Schools
7 - Ukranian Catholic Schools

Site visits were made by the principal investigator and the research associate to observe the work of the corrective reading teachers with different group's of students, the school facilities, the instructional program, and the evaluation and follow up of the students' progress. The observers used guidelines in collecting information about the effectiveness of the program in each sample school.

In order to assess the increase in pupils' reading achievement and general motivation and interest, two aspects of pupil evaluation were considered. Standardized test scores on the Metropolitan Reading Test and the Gray Oral Reading Test were obtained from the Board of Education and were statistically analyzed to determine the presence of significant gains in general reading achievement. A student questionnaire was devised to assess the educational aspirations in years of desired school attendance of secondary school pupils.

In order to assess the reactions, opinions and insights of the Title I professional staff and the non-public school staff, questionnaires and rating scales were devised. The specific instruments are: Field Supervisor Questionnaire, Corrective Reading Teacher Questionnaire, Principals Questionnaire, and Classroom Teachers Questionnaire.

In order to assess the reactions and opinions of a random selection of parents a Parent Questionnaire was devised.

Copies of all questionnaires and the guidelines are found in the appendices of this report.

All the questionnaires were personally delivered by the evaluation team at the time of a site visit and the parent questionnaires were distributed in May 1972 by the Corrective Reading Teachers. All questionnaires were returned directly to the evaluation team by the respondents. The student questionnaire was administered by the Corrective Reading Teacher in December 1971 during a regularly scheduled reading session.

On January 21, 1972 the Principal Investigator met with the Coordinator of the Title I Non-Public School Corrective Reading Program and the Field Supervisors. On March 17, 1972 the Research Associate attended a general meeting of the Corrective Reading Teachers.

The standardized test scores were obtained from the Board of Education at the end of June 1972.

General Evaluation of Program Implementation

The twenty-seven sample schools were visited by the Principal Investigator and the Research Associate to observe the implementation of the Corrective Reading Program. During each visit the Investigator had the opportunity to speak personally with the Corrective Reading Teacher and Building Principal, and observe the teacher with about two groups of students. Also various aspects of the program were noted through the use of observation guidelines. Three major aspects of the program were noted: schools facilities, instructional program, and evaluation and follow-up. The information included in this General Evaluation section was obtained through direct observations of the sites and whenever possible, review of the lesson plans of the Corrective Reading Teachers, pupil instructional materials, pupil records and reports, and interviews with the reading teachers and principals.

A. School Facilities

1. General Conditions and Limitations

No instructional program can be efficiently implemented in an environment that is not conducive to good teaching, good learning, and generally healthy living. An ideal classroom would be big enough to allow students and teacher to move freely around the room, have adequate light, heat and ventilation. Desks, chairs, and other furniture would be appropriate in size and construction for the students. There would be an easily accessible storage area for materials and supplies. Also, the room would be fairly centrally located to the other school facilities, yet be generally free from excessive disturbances.

While the above indicates an ideal, all characteristics do not need to be present for the efficient implementation of the program.

The corrective reading services were located in generally adequate classrooms in 20 of the 27 schools visited. Of the remaining seven, two were located in storefront annexes one block from the school, one was in a storeroom off the gymnasium, one was in a corner of the school library, one was in an inner windowless room used as a storage area and coatroom for office personnel, and two were in the school cafeteria.

The evaluators realize that the schools being serviced have limited resources and their facilities are severely overtaxed. However, the allotment of space is a direct indication of the priority the school administration places on the corrective reading services. When these services are not provided with conditions comparable to those throughout the rest of the school plant, there is an implication that the services are incidental to the overall school instructional program.

2. Availability of the Special Services

Almost all of the sample schools were also serviced by one or more of

the following: Title I Psychologists, Guidance Counselors, Social Workers, Speech Therapists, English-as-a-Second Language Teachers, or Corrective Mathematics Teachers. In all the sample schools except the seven in which the Corrective Reading Teacher conducted a five-day-a-week program, the facilities were shared with one or more of the other Special Service staff.

In two of the sample schools, two different Title I Corrective Reading Teachers provided service to the schools. In five other schools, additional corrective reading service was provided by "decentralized" Title I money.

In none of the sample schools was there evidence of a formal procedure for the exchange of information between the Corrective Reading Teachers and other Special Service staff members, i.e. Psychologists, Guidance Counselors, and Speech Therapists. Some of the Corrective Reading Teachers indicated that there was an informal exchange of information when requested by the Guidance Counselor. None of the Reading Teachers gave evidence of having complete information concerning which of their students were receiving other special services.

3. Teacher/Pupil Ratios and Schedules

As was indicated above in "Program Description" the typical teacher/pupil ratio was 1:10. However, when a school was serviced for only one-half day per week, the ratio was reduced to 1:5. Each session was generally scheduled for one hour. However, in schools where the Reading room was located in annexes, basement cafeterias or storerooms as much time as fifteen minutes was allotted for the changing of groups.

Teachers' schedules included five periods a day--four teaching periods and one conference, preparation, or testing period. Except where a teacher was in a school only once a week and where "5 day-a-week" programs were in effect, the Corrective Reading teachers met with each group of children twice a week. In two of the six schools receiving service for 5 full days certain groups were scheduled for daily periods of instruction.

B. Instructional Program

The instructional program includes all the corrective teachers' efforts to improve the reading achievement of the children and the materials they utilize to this end. There is an overall program set forth by the proposal and guidelines for the city-wide program. This section of the report will deal with a description of the overall instructional program and then with the amount and degree of variation found in the program among the schools sampled for evaluation.

An attempt was made in this part of the evaluation to treat "instruction" apart from "facilities" with full knowledge of how the latter influences the former. However, since good instruction can occur in poor facilities and

bad instruction in good facilities, the evaluators sought to identify and judge those aspects of the Corrective Reading Services personnel.

The teachers selected to be Corrective Reading Teachers generally have had public school classroom experience and have completed or are involved in graduate study. There is no requirement that the teachers must have had special courses in reading improvement.

Materials and supplies were ordered centrally for all the schools. For each school serviced by the corrective teachers, storage cabinets, book shelves and file cabinets were provided by the central office. Other equipment included moveable chalkboards, teachers' lockers, typewriters, and ditto machines.

Instructional materials were centrally selected for their relevance to the teaching of the educationally disadvantaged, retarded reader. For each school a basic selection of materials was provided which included study texts, workbooks, linguistic materials, programmed materials, manipulative materials, games, and trade books. In some schools, reading machines and multi-media supplies were provided. Supplies included paper, pencils, envelopes, notebooks, chalk, erasers, clips, project paper and crayons.

During the corrective reading session participants were to be involved in three basic activities: (a) verbal discussions geared to develop and enrich a basic meaning vocabulary, (b) work analysis activity geared to develop independence in decoding, and (c) guided and independent reading activities geared to develop ability to comprehend written materials. All activities were to be based on specific needs for the purpose of correcting diagnosed weaknesses. In order to foster the one-to-one relationship with the corrective reading teacher, pupils were also to be involved in individual conferences with the teacher during the session.

The corrective reading teachers were provided with registers for keeping pupil attendance. They had notebooks in which daily or weekly lesson plans were kept as well as diagnostic information about each student enrolled in the program. Individual folders were maintained by the teachers for keeping each student's standardized test scores. General forms were provided for lesson plans and letters sent home to parents.

The following sub-sections will report on information gathered during site visits.

1. Teacher Rapport with Pupils

Rapport may be largely a factor of personality and of a blending of personalities between the teacher and the student. In the 27 sites visited, no uniformity of rapport was found. Good rapport was noted especially by pupil behavior in the attention they gave during a lesson and the enthusiasm they manifested at the beginning and end of the instructional session. Generally the corrective teachers were pleasant to the children, responsive to their expressed and unexpressed needs and seemed to be liked by them. Seven teachers were observed, however, who were judged to have poor rapport with their pupils. This was illustrated by one teacher who talked "at" the children for forty minutes of the sixty minute period; another who did not seem to notice the children were paying attention neither to her nor their assigned lessons; and another who gave no consideration to the pupils' questions not having a direct relation to the story she had assigned them. The other four seemed to go through the lessons without enthusiasm and appeared as relieved as the children when the sessions were over.

2. Teacher Use of Materials

As noted above, the corrective teachers had, at each school they serviced, a basic supply of instructional materials and supplies. Since these commercial materials are intended for as wide an audience as possible, they generally provide instruction and practice over a wide range of reading skills and subject topics. A teacher judiciously utilizing these materials should be able to effectively instruct children with a variety of needs.

All of the corrective reading teachers observed used the commercial materials and all of the teachers prepared some sort of supplemental materials usually in the form of "dittoed" handouts. The effectiveness of both commercial and teacher-made instructional materials will be evaluated below in sub-section #4: "amount of individualization within group setting."

3. Lesson Planning

Each of the corrective teachers had a notebook, usually looseleaf, in which lesson plans for each particular group were kept. Most of the plans were daily, but some teachers prepared lessons to cover their working week. All of the plans contained a section for lesson purpose, general language development, group instruction and individual instruction. These plans were kept chronologically for each group.

At all times the appropriate lesson was observed.

4. Amount of Individualization within Group Setting

One present overriding concern in education is the matter of providing instruction to meet the particular needs of each pupil. Individualization can occur by:

(1) allowing each child to select materials which are important to him;
(2) allowing each child to work through a common lesson at his own rate and ability; and
(3) providing unique materials suited to the identified needs of each child.

In any instructional program a combination of these approaches can be effective.

The amount and kind of individualization varied as greatly as the number of Corrective Reading Teachers. Two teachers were observed who, though their plans called for some sort of individual instruction, conducted only group lessons. One teacher said that she attempted to individualize, but could not because of the size and diverse make-up of her groups. Ten teachers had select pupils come to their desks and read the assigned material orally which in all cases was identical with what the remainder of the group was doing. In all but two of these cases, when a pupil demonstrated difficulty he was given assistance.

The remaining 15 teachers attempted to individualize by either sub-dividing the groups for different assignments or by providing different assignments for all children in the group. In only two cases were the instructional materials not of the commercial kind.

To illustrate effective individualization, two observations will be cited. In both cases the teachers had whole group and individual lessons. Both teachers had an educational aide provided them through local funds. The aides were trained by the Corrective Teacher to give a specific type of instruction in addition to doing clerical and management tasks. In one case the teacher relied primarily on the use of commercial materials, whereas the other had a large number of games, word cards and other manipulative devices made by her for specific children. The common factors of these two programs seemed to be: the teacher was well organized; the teacher had an aide; the teacher knew the collective and individual needs of her pupils; the teacher knew the limitations of the materials at her disposal; the teacher serviced the school five days a week.

No discussion of individualization of instruction within the corrective program is complete without reference to the particular needs of a large group of students for whom English is not their native language. This group included speakers of Spanish, Greek, Ukranian, Hebrew and Yiddish. All of the students in the program possess a minimum mastery of English, yet their speech is greatly influenced by their bilinguistic backgrounds. None of the corrective teachers gave evidence of being aware that these students had problems differing from a retarded reader for whom English is his native language.

5. Evidence of Goals

The major objectives of the Corrective Reading Services are to increase the pupils' proficiency in reading, to increase general achievement and to stimulate some motivation for increased education. To achieve objectives such as these, good educational practices dictate that the means be stated in long range and immediate attainable and measurable goals which are related to the needs of society, the schools and the learner.

The general long range goal of the Corrective Reading Services was to have each child reach the level equal to his actual grade level. Immediate goals were left to the individual school and/or corrective teacher.

In all of the sample schools, the corrective teachers and the building principals expressed the long range goal noted above and only indicated "lesson purposes" as immediate goals. Although each corrective reading teacher prepared a general long range plan for the pupils receiving remediation which was filed with Coordinator of the program and revised periodically, there was no evidence of any specific, short range criteria against which to judge the pupils' progress. In effect the children selected at the beginning remained in the program throughout the year. There was less than 1% turnover in any school and that was due to a pupil leaving the school area.

The absence of any evidence of specific, attainable and measurable goals is of great importance for developing any system of evaluation and the subject of "goals" will be continued in the following sections.

C. Evaluation and Follow-Up

Before evaluation can occur, one must know what is to be evaluated. Then a purpose must be established for the evaluation as well as a standard for assessing a desirable or satisfactory level of attainment. The first step, therefore, is an explicit statement of objectives and the criteria with which the attinment of these objectives will be measured.

1. On-Going Diagnostic Procedures

As noted in the previous section there was an absence of any specific objectives other than the one general objective of raising the mean

achievement level by six academic months. There was, however, an attempt by all the corrective teachers to maintain a record of standardized test results and by about half of the teachers to keep a record of informal assessments made during individual conferences. No consistency was seen in the type of information recorded for each pupil among the various teachers or even within the roster of pupils serviced by the same teacher. By and large the information consisted of a list of words the particular pupil didn't know and the deviant responses given by him. A few teachers indicated that these notes gave them information about providing individual assignments for the pupils. As noted above, very few teachers actually prepared "individual lessons." Two teachers had anecdotal notations in the pupils' permanent record folder.

2. Relation to Total School Reading Program

As originally intended, the Corrective Reading Services were to supplement the basic reading program the pupils received in their respective schools. The Corrective Services were to compensate for deficiencies within the child so that he could attain an achievement level commensurate with his grade placement.

In one-third of the schools visited the Corrective Teacher provided the only reading instruction the child received that day. Most often these schools utilized reduced range grouping by regrouping among the 8 classes on a grade level during the reading period. The administrators of these schools indicated their belief that children achieving at the lowest level needed the expertise of a teacher with special training. Regardless of the accuracy of this belief the practice still was counter to the intention of the entire program.

In the other schools, the Corrective Program was an entity separate and apart from the school reading program. As will be noted below, in all but one case the corrective teacher was not aware of the type, scope or level of the classroom reading instruction of all the children serviced in the program.

3. Feedback of Information

A supplementary program must add a new dimension to some already established on-going reading program. The smooth and efficient functioning of both necessitates adequate communication between them.

The corrective teachers prepared required reports for the Central Director of the Non-Public School Corrective Reading Services and for the principals of the host schools about the pupil's progress. However, there was little observed evidence that the schools used the information to influence the regular instruction of the pupils.

All of the corrective teachers indicated that they informally exchanged information about the pupils with the classroom teachers, but there was no evidence this information influenced instruction. In fact no corrective teacher indicated that even this informal exchange occurred with all the classroom teachers of all the pupils serviced.

Information about a child's progress reached a parent only if that parent attended a conference during school time. Very few parents attended these conferences and over 75% of the parents received no information about their children from the corrective teachers. The reason may be due to a conflict with employment and/or living patterns induced by nighttime employment, or due to the language differences between the corrective teacher and the parents. This was a problem not only in the schools with a large Spanish speaking population, but also where the parents' native language was Greek, Ukranian, Hebrew, and Yiddish.

4. Supervision

The maintainance and improvement of any instructional program depends upon good supervision. This entails knowledgeable observation, evaluation, communication and staff development. Each of the corrective teachers was supervised by a Field Supervisor and the building principal.

The Field Supervisors formally observed the corrective teachers on a regualr basis and filed reports of these observations. Informal visits were made to assess problems, introduce new materials and provide general support and assistance. Periodic in-service sessions were held with all the teachers under the Field Supervisor's authority. None of these activities were directly observed by the evaluators.

The Board of Education provided all of the building principals with guidelines for the supervision of Board of Education personnel in non-public schools. Information gathered from interviews with the principals indicated that: the guidelines were utilized to differing degrees, the quality of the supervision varied, understanding of the program was not consistent, and the amount of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the program varied.

The principals' role in supervising the corrective teachers was to be involved in all aspects of the program except direct evaualtion of the teachers instructional competency. Three-fourths of the principals indicated complete satisfaction with the program. Two principals did not know the days of the week that the corrective teacher was in the building. The main source of dissatisfaction among the remaining principals was the reading teachers' roles in relation to the entire school program.

These principals felt the program functioned as a separate entity and the schools did not receive the full benefit of the teachers' expertise. Two principals stated a desire for the corrective teachers to have time allotted to assist teachers in their classrooms in implementing a classroom reading program for the children eligible for corrective reading services. One principal stated her desire for more funds to be decentralized so that instructional materials could be ordered to meet the specific needs of the pupils.

Pupil Evaluation

The major objective of the program was to increase the average work attack and oral reading skills and the skills of word meaning and paragraph comprehension of the participating pupils.

To determine the extent to which the corrective reading program may have increased the pupils' proficiency in reading, the pre-test and post-test scores on the Metropolitan Reading Test and the Gray Oral Reading Paragraphs for the pupils in the sample schools were analyzed. Since comparable data could not be obtained for a control group of students attending the sample schools, the mean gains for the group were tested against the hypothesis that there would be gains on both tests of at least .6 grade equivalent units. The data was also assessed to determine the percent of pupils achieving an increase in their reading performance by grade level units.

To determine the extent to which the corrective reading program may have increased the secondary students' educational aspirations, the students' responses to a questionnaire were analyzed.

A. Evaluation of Pupil Gains

The pre-test and post-test scores on the Metropolitan Achievement and the Gray Oral Reading Paragraphs of the pupils in grades 1-6 and a random sample of the the pre-test and post-test scores on the Iowa Silent Reading Test of the pupils in grades 7-12 who participated in the program during the 1971-72 school year were analyzed.

Table 2: Tests of Significance of Gains in Silent Reading N=1340

Pre-test		Post-test		
$\bar{x}$	S.D.	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	t^a
3.03	1.39	3.7	1.35	42.00

a The t-ratio adjusted for the evaluation ofthe hypothesis at .6 grade unit gains was 5.35 ($p < .01$)

Table 2 reports the means and standard deviations for all pupils in grades 1-6 on the Metropolitan Achievement Test. The difference between the pre-test and post-test mean was highly significant and the evaluation objective of an overall mean gain of at least .6 grade level units was achieved.

Table 3: Distribution of Reported Gains by Grade Level Units on the Metropolitan Achievement Test N=1340

Gains in Grade Units	Percent of Population Achieving Gain
no gain	2
.1 - .5	46
.6 -1.0	30
1.1 -1.9	19
2.0+	3

Table 3 reports the distribution of the gains on the Metropolitan Achievement test by grade level units. A gain of .1 to .5 grade level units was achieved by 46% of the pupils and a gain of .6 to 1.0 grade level units was achieved by another 30% of the students. It is important to note that these gains amount to less than the gain that would be achieved by pupils under normal circumstances. Since these pupils must have been approximately 2.0 or more grade level units retarded in reading achievement to begin in the program, these pupils in relation to their peers are still retarded to the same degree.

Table 3a: Predicted vs. Actual Post-test Gains on the Metropolitan Achievement Test N=280

Predicted		Actual		
$\bar{x}$	S.D.	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	t
3.38	1.21	3.68	1.30	9.66*

* $P < .001$

Table 4 reports the means and standard deviations for all pupils in grades 1-6 on the Gray Oral Reading Paragraphs. The difference between the pre-test and post-test means was very highly significant and the evaluation objective of an overall mean gain of at least .6 grade level units was achieved.

Table 4: Test of Significance of Gains in Oral Reading N=1253

Pre-test		Post-test		
$\bar{x}$	S.D.	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	t^a
2.77	1.46	3.79	1.72	39.27

a The t-ratio adjusted for the evaluation of the hypothesis at .6 grade unit gains was 17.29 ($p < .001$)

Table 4a: Predicted vs. Actual Post-test Gains on the Gray Oral Reading Paragraphs N=272

Predicted		Actual		
$\bar{x}$	S.D	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	t
3.10	1.62	3.80	1.64	13.80*

* $p < .001$

Table 4b: Predicted vs. Actual Post-test Gains on the Iowa Silent Reading Tests N=34

Predicted		Actual		
$\bar{x}$	S.D.	$\bar{x}$	S.D.	t
7.63	1.10	9.68	1.94	6.79*

* $p < .001$

It should be noted that the Gray Oral Reading Paragraphs is a test with only one form and a scoring procedure which is very sensitive to and influenced by a time factor. The highly significant gains could, on this test, be attributed to 1) Familiarity by the pupil with the format content of the test, and/or 2) the familiarity and sensitivity of the corrective reading teacher to the style and patterns of the pupils' reading. This last point is important because the possibility that differences between pre-test and post-test scores could be due to the teacher being more able at the end of the year to distinguish between a reading error and an apparent error which was no more than a result of a speech pattern. Therefore, judgements about the program should not be made solely upon the basis of a test which is so highly dependent upon personal differences in discrimination and perception.

Tables 3a and 4a report the predicted versus actual post-test scores for a randomly selected group of students on the Metropolitan Achievement Test and the Gray Oral Reading Paragraphs. The difference between the predicted and actual post-test scores on both measures was very highly significant. Therefore, it can be concluded that the corrective reading program made a significant contribution to the pupils' growth in reading achievement during the 1971-72 school year.

Six non-public high schools received corrective reading service during the 1971-72 school year. These schools were:

St. Joseph

Sts. Peter & Paul Annex

Bishop McDonnell

Cathedral

Bishop Dubois

Bishop Laughlin

Complete data was obtained only for the first three named schools because the others received service for only a small portion of the year.

Table 4b reports the predicted versus actual post-test gains on the Iowa Silent Reading Tests for a randomly selected sample from the three schools for which there was complete data. The difference between the predicted and the actual scores was significantly different. It can be concluded that the corrective reading program made a significant contribution to the reading growth of the high school students during the 1971-72 school year.

B. Evaluation of Secondary School Pupils' Aspirations

The original evaluation objective was to assess whether a significant increase occurred in the educational aspirations of the program participants as measured by the number of years they remained in school. Since this proved unfeasible, the evaluation objective was modified to evaluate:

Whether the educational aspirations of the participants increased as measured by the number of years of desired school attendance over that of expected school attendance. This evaluation was undertaken only with secondary school students through a questionnaire. Table 5 summarizes the students' responses.

Table 5: Student Aspiration N=45

Aspiration	Level Desired to Attain	Level Expected to Attain
Quit school	0	0
Attend some high school	0	0
Graduate High School	7	14
Attend Secretarial or trade School	6	5
Attend College	8	11
Graduate College	24	15

$Chi^2 = 4.974$ (chi^2 at .05 = 7.815)

Each of the possible responses were equated with a level of education. If a difference occurred between the responses indicating what the students desired as an ultimate level of education and that which they actually expected to attain, then the differences could be attributed in part to the corrective reading program.

A Chi-square analysis of the data revealed the responses between the desired level of achievement and the expected level of achievement were not significant.

One possible explanation for the lack of significant results may be that the original aspirations of these students were high. An examination of the data reveals that all of the students were high. An examination of the data reveals that all of the students expected to graduate from high school and over half the students expected to have some sort of post high school education. Another possible cause of the non-significant results is the samll sample.

In indicating the type of employment they desired after finishing school, the students listed a variety of jobs all of which required some post high school training. The general category with the highest response was "secretarial" - including legal and executive. This of course could be due to the entire sample consisting of girls. In indicating the type of employment they expected after finishing school, the students indicated generally the same areas of occupation. There were though, fewer references to occupations requiring extensive post college education. Table 6 lists the common occupations cited by the students.

Table 6: Occupational Aspirations of Students (Ranked in order of preference)

Desired Occupations:

Secretarial
Nursing
Business related (including accounting; bookkeeping, computer operators, etc.)

Medical or related professions
Miscellaneous

Expected Occupations

Secretarial
Business related
Social related (includes teachers, counselors, librarians, etc.)
Medical or related professions

Staff Evaluation of the Program

The staff evaluation of the corrective reading program was obtained through the use of questionnaires. All of the corrective reading teachers, field supervisors and principals as well as a sample of the classroom teachers in the non-public schools were asked to complete the respective questionnaires. In the analyses which follow, the responses to the questionnaires are tabulated.

A. Corrective Reading Teachers

Twenty-three corrective reading teachers returned questionnaires. Table 7 summarizes the responses of these teachers.

Table 7: Evaluation of the Program Corrective Reading Teachers N=23

Question			Number of Responses
How many schools do you service?			
	1		13
	2		6
	3		3
	4		1
Did you hold this position last year?			
	Yes		17
	No		6
If you held this position last year. Did the number of schools over last year:			
	increase?		3
	stay same?		11
	decrease?		3
If you held this position last year, did the number of children over last year:			
	increase?		8
	stay same?		9
	decrease?		0
Have you been observed this year?			
	Yes		23
	No		0
How many times?	one time		1
	two times		4
	three times		6
	more than three		12
By whom?			
	Field Supervisor		23
	Other		0
What opportunity was there for you to meet with the classroom teacher to discuss a pupil's progress?			
	none		0
	infrequent		4
	frequent		19
Were these conferences arranged:		informally	23
		formally	5

Table 7 - continued

Which of the following did you think were STRONG or WEAK components of your particular instructional program?

	Strong	Weak
Assistance and supervision from field supervisor	18	0
Cooperation from other school personnel	16	1
Diagnostic teaching	18	0
Exchange of information with classroom teachers	10	3
Flexible grouping procedures	13	2
Freedom to develop own program	15	2
Individualization of instruction	17	0
Preparation of instructional lessons & materials	22	0
Rapport with children	23	0
Record keeping and reporting	9	5
Relationship with parents	6	5
Teacher training program: Large group sessions	10	1
Teacher training program: Small group sessions	17	1

Seventeen teachers indicated they were part of the program in the previous school year. Three of these seventeen were servicing an increased number of schools and three were serving fewer schools than in the previous year. Eight indicated an increase in their caseload and none showed a decreased caseload. All twenty-three had been observed by a field supervisor. Eighteen reading teachers had been observed three or more times and five had been observed fewer than three times during the school year. No other person observed any of the corrective teachers except for the project evaluators.

All corrective teachers indicated they had some opportunity to meet informally with the classroom teachers. Nineteen reported that these meetings were frequent. Five corrective teachers indicated they had both informally and formally met with classroom teachers.

In the assessment of the strong points of their particular program, the corrective teachers as a group indicated that the two strongest components were: rapport with children, and preparation of instructional lessons and material. Other very strong components were indicated as assistance and supervision from field supervisor, diagnostic teaching, individualization of instruction, and teacher training: small group sessions.

In the assessment of the weak points of their particular program, the corrective teachers as a group indicated very little as being weak with their programs. The two components which were indicated as weak were: record keeping and relationship with parents.

In general, the corrective teachers' comments made favorable comments about the kind of assistance they received from the Field Supervisors. The following comments are illustrative:

"discussed problems encountered. Advice given and ideas suggested"

"a sample lesson was taught."

"Suggestions to improve instruction given."

"I was given help in setting up the program."

"Some teaching suggestions, plus actual help in individual teaching."

"Supportive, gives valid suggestions."

"definite suggestions for specific problems were shown."

The corrective teachers stated that the most satisfaction in their particular programs came from being able to establish close personal relationships with the children in small group or individual situations and from being able to follow the growth of the children. Typical comments were:

"Final results. When a child is on grade level, it is most satisfactory."

"Because I can get close to the children I have the opportunity to see growth."

"Close relationship between pupil and teacher made possible by small groupings."

Other things which brought satisfaction to their programs were noted as the variety and availability of instructional materials and supplies and good relationships with the host school administration and personnel.

The one thing that most of the corrective reading teachers would change if they had an opportunity would be the size of the groups. It was felt by these teachers that smaller groups would allow them to individualize instruction better than they now do. Other things noted were to increase the amount of classroom and storage space, to have the choice of selecting materials for themselves, to improve diagnostic procedures, to observe similar programs in public schools and to be able to work with children in their regular classrooms.

B. Field Supervisors

Five Field Supervisors returned questionnaires. In this section, the individual responses of the supervisors on the questionnaire will be compared.

Three of the supervisors indicated that the major objective of the program was to help the pupil improve his reading ability so that he could function better in the regular classroom. One also indicated that program should help the pupil to function better in life situations, and another

supervisor also indicated the program should help the pupil to gain pleasure from reading. Of the other two supervisors one indicated that the program was to bring each pupil to grade level in reading, and the other that the pupil should be helped to read to the best of his ability.

All five supervisors indicated that they felt the corrective reading teachers and the individual building principals all fairly well understood the program's goals.

The supervisors listed the following supervisory activities as being provided for the corrective reading teachers:

conferring individually and in small groups
demonstrating lessons
assisting in diagnosis and testing
selecting, securing and providing materials
assisting with long range planning
suggesting instructional techniques
training and evaluating teachers
communicating with parents

For outlining a typical week in their schedule, all five supervisors indicated that the majority of their time is spent with the corrective reading teachers. Two supervisors indicated this accounts for 95% of their time. The other three supervisors indicated that amount of time devoted to any activity with the corrective teachers was flexible and varied from week to week depending upon the particular teacher's needs.

The supervisors indicated that aside from the supervisory activities noted above their schedule included activities such as:

administrative details - checking records, reports, attendance
attendance at meetings
conferences with principals
instruction of individual pupils in particular schools

Only two Field Supervisors indicated special problems which hindered their functioning. One was the difficulty of meeting time schedules because of heavy traffic and then once at the school, to find safe, legal parking. The other supervisor indicated the problem was personal safety in the neighborhoods of some of the host schools.

Only one supervisor indicated that the program could be made more effective by a change in Field Supervisors role. The supervisor felt that a central storehouse and delivery service would relieve the supervisor from the burden of transporting materials to the corrective teachers and that supervisors should serve as a consultant to the host school about improving the entire reading program.

Two supervisors indicated a change in the corrective teachers role should be to reduce the pupil/teacher ratio. One supervisor indicated a change for the better would be to allow the corrective teacher to assist classroom teachers with improving methods, techniques and materials.

One supervisor made an additional comment that no aid should go to parochial schools directly, and that the corrective program should be kept separate and apart from the other programs in the host school.

C. Classroom Teachers

Five classroom teacher questionnaires were distributed in each of the sample schools and 69 questionnaires were returned. Table 8 summarizes the responses on the classroom teachers. Generally, the classroom teachers responded favorably to the program.

Table 8: Evaluation of the Program - Classroom Teachers N=69

Question	Response (in %) a great deal	some	not at all
In your opinion, were the children in your class being helped by the corrective reading program?	48	50	2
Was there opportunity for you to discuss the children's problems with the corrective reading teacher?	49	43	8
Were you provided with information concerning the children's progress?	31	50	19
Did you receive assistance from anyone in developing classroom instruction to meet the needs of the children in corrective reading?	10	45	42
Did parents show concern about their children's reading problems?	20	65	15
Have you been provided with information concerning the goals and objectives of the corrective reading program?	15	57	28
Did you feel the corrective reading teacher in any way makes a contribution to the total instructional program in your school?	68	29	3

The classroom teachers indicated that they felt the corrective teachers were making a contribution to the total school instructional program and were helping the children from their classes in the corrective reading protram.

Only eight percent of the teachers responded that they had no opportunity to discuss a child's problems with the corrective teacher, but nineteen percent of the teachers indicated they received no information concerning the children's progress.

Sixty five percent of the teachers felt that parents only show some concern about their children's problems; while twenty percent felt parents showed a great deal of concern, and fifteen percent felt parents showed no concern.

Many classromm teachers indicated a lack of assistance in developing classroom instruction to meet the needs of children in corrective reading. Forty two percent indicated they receive no assistance at all while forty five percent indicated they receive only some assistance.

Many teachers made a general comment about the worth of the program in their schools. It is interesting to note that the one characteristic which was noted as leading to the success of the program in one school was nearly the same as that which was indicated as the failure in another. Specifically, many teachers felt the main worth of the program was the corrective teachers' rapport with the children and the enthusiasm instilled in the children to read and learn. However, other teachers felt that the program was unsuccessful because the children did not like the teacher and were unmotivated to achieve either in corrective reading or the regular classroom.

Some of the classroom teachers also indicated in their comments that even though the program was beneficial, the scheduling disrupted the regular classroom routine and took the children away from instruction in other subjects. Other teachers also indicated a desire for greater continuity of the program with the reading instruction of the classroom. They felt this could be effected through an increase in the amount of information exchanged between the classroom teacher and the corrective teacher and by allowing the corrective teacher to work directly in the classroom with both the children and the teacher.

In their comments, the teachers also indicated a need to enlarge the program to include more students and to make the selection procedure more flexible.

D. Principals

Nineteen principals completed and returned the questionnaire. In general their comments were favorable towards the program. Table 9 summarizes the principals' responses on the questionnaire.

Table 9: Evaluation of Program - Principals N=17

Question	Number of Responses	
Were you satisfied with the corrective reading program as it was functioning in your school?		
very satisfied	10	
generally satisfied	8	
not satisfied	1	
Which of the following would you say were STRONG and WEAK aspects of the corrective reading program in your school?	Strong	Weak
Skills program	12	0
Coordination with other school programs	5	8
Competency of corrective teacher	15	0
Materials used	12	1
Exchange of information between corrective teacher and classroom teachers	9	4
Did you make observations of the corrective reading teacher?		
Yes	12	
No	7	

Only one principal was totally dissatisfied with the program. The strong aspects of the corrective program as indicated by the principals were the skills program, the corrective teachers' competency and the materials used. They indicated as the weakest aspects the coordination of the corrective program with other school programs and the exchange of information between the corrective teacher and the classroom teachers.

Sixty three percent of the principals made observations of the corrective reading teacher.

In their general comments about the program about half of the principals indicated a need for greater coordination and articulation between the host school's reading program and the corrective reading program. The various ways they suggested were 1) allowing the corrective teacher to work directly with the classroom teachers in developing reading programs for the children 2) increasing the services to five full days a week, 3) developing more flexible guidelines, and 4) allowing the principal and the host school greater involvement in the selection of the children, the materials and the corrective teachers.

Parents' Reactions to Program

In order to obtain some of the parents' opinions of the effectiveness of the corrective program as well as some estimation of the achievement of their children enrolled in the program, a questionnaire was distributed to ten parents from each of the sample schools. In all, 114 questionnaires were returned, 104 of which had complete information which was tabulated. Because of the large number of Spanish speaking families serviced by the porgram, the questionnaire was translated into Spanish. Both forms went to these families.

Table 10: Evaluation of the Program - Parents N=104

Question	% Responding
In general, which of the following best describes your child's interest towards corrective reading instruction?	
Very interested	75
Somewhat interested	24
Not at all interested	1
Do you feel that your child is benefiting from the corrective reading program?	
Greatly	73
Somewhat	24
Little	3
Have you received any information about your child's progress in the corrective reading program?	
Yes	77
No	23
If yes - how was the information received?	
Personal conference	86
Workshops	2
Group conference	6
Written	6

Table 10 summarizes the parents' responses. There seems to be overwhelming indication that the parents believe that their children are greatly interested in the program and benefiting greatly from the program. Seventy seven percent of the parents had received some sort of information about their children's progress and the most usual way this information was received was by personal conference.

These results must be accepted with some reservation, however. The parent questionnaires were distributed through the corrective reading

teachers who sent them home via the pupils. Obviously,because of the sampling technique employed by the evaluators, the possibility exists that the sample was biased toward those parents who had had some contact with the corrective teacher or whom the corrective teacher felt would be cooperative in completing the questionnaire.

In their general comments, the parents indicated a strong desire to receive some sort of written evaluation of their children's progress in the corrective reading program.

Cost Effectiveness

No assessment of the cost effectiveness of the program could be done because the information necessary will not be provided by the Bureau of the Budget until after the due date of this report.

Summary Findings and Recommendations

The New York City Board of Education under the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 (Title I) has instituted a program of special corrective reading services for disadvantaged children in non public schools. The program is organized so that small groups of children meet with teachers specially recruited and trained to diagnose and instruct students with reading problems. The program is in its sixth full year of operation.

The major objectives of the program were to increase the students' word attack and oral reading skills, to increase the students' skills of word meaning and paragraph comprehension and to increase the students' educational aspirations.

Formal evaluation of the 1971-72 school year program began in January and continued through May, the evaluation concentrated on the degree to which the above objectives were met. Evaluation procedures included site visits to a stratified sample of 27 schools selected from all the schools participating in the program, an analysis of the oral and silent reading test scores for the pupils in the sample schools; and an analysis of responses by the professional staff and parents to questionnaires designed to measure their reactions to the program. A questionnaire to assess secondary school pupils' educational aspirations was also administered.

This final report is limited to the operation of the corrective reading program during the 1971-72 school year. It includes an evaluation of the program's implementation, an assessment of the program's effectiveness, and an evaluation of the program by the professional staff and parents who participated in the program.

An analysis of the data yielded the following findings.

1. On site observation of the program in progress revealed that:

a) The children generally were receiving instruction in adequate facilities. Seven sites were considered less than adequate.

b) All of the schools had other special service staff but there was no evidence of formal procedures for the exchange of information between the corrective teacher and the other special staff although they both serviced children in common.

c) The teachers generally had good rapport with the children.

d) The teachers, except for a few instances, relied in their instruction upon the commercial material provided for them by the central office.

e) The teachers espoused a level of individualization of instruction which was not evident.

f) Aside from the gerneral long term plans filed by the corrective reading teacher with the Coordinator, the corrective teachers and the host administrators had limited short term goals for the children in the program.

g) The corrective teachers showed no consistency in their ability to diagnose reading difficulties except on a gross scale and to prescribe specific instruction for remediation.

h) Although the corrective teachers prepared formal evaluation reports for the principals of the host schools there was little evidence that these reports were put to use by the schools to influence the regular instruction of the pupils.

i) The corrective teachers were well supervised by the Field Supervisors and the supervision was positively received by the reading teachers. There was, however, some confusion on the part of the building principals over their role in the supervision of the corrective teachers, even though they were provided with written guidelines by the Program Coordinator. (See Item 7 below.)

2. Analysis of the reading test scores on both the Metropolitan Achievement test and the Gray Oral Reading Paragraphs indicated substantial mean gain in the areas under study. For each instance the gains were signigicant at the .01 level.

3. Analysis of the reading scores on the Iowa Silent Reading tests indicated that actual post-test mean scores were significantly greater than the predicted mean scores at the .001 level.

4. Analysis of the secondary students educational aspiration revealed significant differences between their desired final educational level and their expected final educational level. It was noted that the students' original educational aspirations were quite high.

5. Analysis of the evaluation of the program by the corrective reading teachers revealed positive reactions toward the program. Strong points in their opinion were their rapport with the children and their preparation of instructional lessons and material.

6. Analysis of the evaluation of the program by the field supervisors revealed a general understanding of the program and little indication of changes which might be instituted.

7. Analysis of the evaluation of the program by the classroom teachers revealed very positive attitudes towards the program.

8. Analysis of the evaluation of the program by the principals revealed favorable attitudes toward the program; however, some confusion was indicated over their role in the supervision of the corrective teachers and the extent to which they, the principals can be involved in decentralizing the administration of certain aspects of the program.

9. Parents responses indicated interest in the program and the belief that their children were benefiting from the program. There was some indication that the parents wished a formal report of their children's progress.

Before considering possible recommendations for increasing the effectiveness of the corrective reading program, some attention must be given to the question: What exactly is the nature of the program? In this regard, is the program "remedial" or "corrective" in nature? The generally accepted definition of "corrective" is concern for students who are less than two years behind their expected level of achievement. The definition for "remedial" is concern for students more than two years behind their expected level of achievement. The term "expected" infers some estimation of the students' ability to learn and includes assessment of physiological, cognitive, psychological, and linguistic (non-native English speaking) variables. Evaluation of students' performance without consideration of the above variables groups together students who can benefit from general instruction (corrective), students who can only benefit from specific, somewhat esoteric procedures (remedial) and students who are achieving at their highest capacity. The present Corrective Reading Program is in reality a conglomerate of programs under a single rubric, attempting to service a diverse population with a multitude of needs. The evaluator realizes that any attempt to alter this aspect of the program brings with it political and sociological implications. Therefore, the following recommendations are made not so much to change the basic format of the Corrective Services, but to make these services more sensitive to the diverse needs found among the schools receiving the service.

1. Host schools should provide adequate facilities. If need be, some of the funds allocated for that school should be directed to improving the condition under which Title I personnel work.

2. The qualifications for corrective reading teachers should include completed graduate study in the specialized area of remedial reading and at least two years of classroom teaching experience.

Where existing tenured teachers do not meet these requirements, all efforts should be made to have them undertake such specialized study.

3. In-service training for all corrective teachers should include application of the newer psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic insights into the teaching of reading as well as the teaching of English to speakers of other languages.

A large proportion of the students receiving instruction were either non-native English speakers or spoke a divergent dialect of English. Recent research in the above disciplines indicate that many so called "errors" in reading are in reality positive and beneficial responses which reveal students to have many more reading competencies than those attributed to them.

4. A true diagnostic oral reading instrument such as the Goodman and Burke Reading Miscue Inventory (Macmillan) should be introduced through the above in-service training. Diagnostic instruments which delineate between actual reading errors and those marked as errors because of dialect divergence, are important to a program that attempts to "individualize" instruction.

5. Individual schools and the Title I staff should undertake the development of written devices for the exchange of information among the corrective teachers, the classroom teachers and the parents.

6. Individual schools in conjunction with the Field Supervisors and corrective teachers should be encouraged to establish local guidelines for a) the selection, teaching, and evaluation of students, b) the selection of materials used in the teaching of these students, c) the selection and supervision of the corrective reading teachers, and d) the expansion of the corrective teachers or field supervisors' roles to include the direct support of the classroom teachers who have children eligible for the program. All guidelines should be approved by the Director of the Office of Title I ESEA Programs to Non Public Schools.

There was a clear indication revealed in the evaluation of the program by the corrective teachers, classroom teachers and principals that the corrective services are most successful as they become articulated with the total school reading program. Because of the diverse needs of the individual schools, flexibility should be established in the Board of Education guidelines for the Corrective Reading Program.

APPENDIX A
Sample for NPS Corrective Reading Evaluation

District	School	
1	Beth Jacob School for Girls	M
1	Our Lady of Sorrows	M
1	St. Brigid	M
2	St. Francis de Sales	M
2	St. Patrick	M
3	Blessed Sacrament	M
4	St. Lucy	M
5	Annunciation	M
6	Incarnation	M
7	SS Peter & Paul	Bx
8	St. Athanasius	Bx
9	Yeshiva Zichron Moshe	Bx
10	St. Simon Stock	Bx
12	St. Anthony of Padua	Bx
13	Sacred Heart	K
14	Holy Ghost Catholic	K
14	St. Vincent de Paul	K
15	St. John the Evangelist	K
15	Argyrios Fantis	K
16	Our Lady of Good Counsel	K
19	Our Lady of Lourdes	K
20	Beth Jacob of Boro Park	K
20	Yeshiva Solomon Kluger	K
21	Yeshiva of Brighton	K
24	Transfiguration	Q
28	St. Monica	Q
31	Immaculate Conception	R

APPENDIX B

Guidelines for Observation

Non-Public Schools Corrective

Reading Program

A. School facilities

1. General conditions and limitations
2. Availability within school of special services; psychologist, guidance counselor, school nurse
3. Teacher/pupil ratio, scheduling, time limits

B. Instructional program

1. Teacher's rapport with pupils
2. Teacher's use of materials; commercial and/or teacher made
3. Lesson planning
4. Amount of individualization within group setting:
    A. Extent of "special" remedial procedures
5. Evidence of immediate and long range goals for:
    A. School-wide
    B. Corrective teacher
    C. Pupil

C. Evaluation and follow-up

1. On-going diagnostic procedures
    A. Informal and/or formal records
    B. Informal tests
    C. Anecdotal records
2. Relationship of corrective program to total school program
3. Feedback of information to:
    A. Classroom teacher
    B. Parents
    C. Pupil
    D. Administrator
4. Supervision by field supervisor and/or building personnel

The above information will be obtained through personal visits by the project evaluator and/or his research associate. Whenever possible, copies of sample lesson plans, reports, records etc. will be obtained.

APPENDIX C

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM

NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

FIELD SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What would you say is the major goal of the corrective reading program?

2. In your opinion, are the program goals fairly well understood by the: (Comment, if you desire)
   a) corrective reading teachers?

   b) building principals?

3. What type of supervisory activities do you provide for the corrective reading teacher? (List examples)

4, Please outline a typical week in your schedule. (Approximate the percentage of your time spent in each type of activity.)

FIELD SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE CONT'D

5. Are there any special problems you face in your position?

6. Assuming legislation and funds were provided, how could the program be made more effective by: a) changes in your role?

   b) changes in the role of the corrective teacher?

7. Other comments:

APPENDIX D

NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

CORRECTIVE READING TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

(Please do not identify yourself on this questionnaire.)

1. How many schools do you service? 1 2 3 4

2. How many children (total) do you see per week in each school?
   school #1_____ school #2_____ school #3_____ school #4_____

3. Did you hold this position last year? yes_____ no_____

4. If the answer to question 3 is yes, has the number of schools and children increased, stayed the same or decreased over last year?
   Schools: I___ S___ D____ Children: I__ S__ D___

5. Have you been observed this year? yes____ no____

If yes, by whom?	How many times?	Was appropriate assistance given? (Please specify)
Field supervisor _____	1 2 3 more	_____
Other (please specify) _____	1 2 3 more	_____

6. What opportunity is there for you to meet with the classroom teacher to discuss a pupil's progress? (check all appropriate)

none _____	informally_____
infrequent_____	formally _____
frequent _____	

7. Which of the following do you think is a STRONG component of your particular instructional program? (Check all appropriate)

Assistance and supervision from field supervisor	_____
Cooperation from other school personnel	_____
Diagnostic teaching	_____
Exchange of information with classroom teachers	_____
Flexible grouping procedures	_____
Freedom to develop own program	_____
Individualization of instruction	_____
Preparation of instructional lessons & materials	_____
Rapport with children	_____
Record keeping and reporting	_____
Relationship with parents	_____
Teacher training program: Large group sessions	_____
Teacher training program: Small group sessions	_____

Which of the above do you think is a WEAK component of your particular program? (Star (*) all appropriate)

NPS Questionnaire for Corrective Reading Teachers Cont'd.

8. Briefly, what one thing do you find most satisfactory in your program?

9. If you could affect a change, what one thing would you want changed?

APPENDIX E

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM

NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Please do not identify yourself or your school on this form.

1. Are you satisfied with the corrective reading program as it is functioning in your school? (Check one)

_____ very satisfied
_____ generally satisfied
_____ not satisfied

Comment, if you desire, on the above:

2. Which of the following would you say are the STRONG aspects of the corrective reading program in your school? (Check all appropriate)

_____ Skills program
_____ Coordination with other school programs
_____ Competency of corrective teacher
_____ Materials used
_____ Exchange of information between corrective teacher and classroom teachers

Which of the above would you say are the WEAK aspects of the corrective reading program in your school? (Star (*) all appropriate)

3. Do you make observations of the corrective reading teacher?

_____ Yes _____ No

4. If the corrective reading program were to be changed, what major changes would you want affected?

5. Other comments, if you have any:

APPENDIX F

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM

NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

CLASSROOM TEACHERS QUESTIONNAIRE

Please do not identify yourself or your school. Answer each question by placing the number of the statement below which comes closest to your thinking and feeling about the corrective reading program in your school:

Code:
1. a great deal
2. some
3. not at all

1. In your opinion, are the children in your class being helped by the corrective reading program? _____

2. Is there opportunity for you to discuss the children's problems with the corrective reading teacher? _____

3. Are you provided with information concerning the children's progress? _____

4. Do you receive assistance from anyone in developing classroom instruction to meet the needs of the children in corrective reading? _____

5. Do parents show concern about their children's reading problems? _____

6. Have you been provided with information concerning the goals and objectives of the corrective reading program? _____

7. Do you feel the corrective reading teacher in any way makes a contribution to the total instructional program in your school? _____

8. Comment:
(Please make a brief general comment which indicates your feeling about the worth of the corrective reading program in your school.)

TEACHING & LEARNING

APPENDIX G

Dear Parent:

We are trying to find out how the Reading Program your child is attending in school can be most useful. To help us with this, we are asking some of the parents to answer a brief questionnaire. Will you please answer the attached questions as best you can, and return the questionnaire to us in the attached, self-addressed, postage paid envelope.

Thank you very much for your help.

Sincerely,

Simone Sternberg

Simone Sternberg

Queridos Padres:

Estamos tratando de mejorar el Programa de Lectura al cual su hijo (o hija) esta asistiendo en la escuela. Para ayudarnos en esto, estamos pidiendole a los padres que nos contesten un breve cuestionario. Les agradeceriamos nos contestasen las siquientes preguntas como mejor puedan y que nos lo devuelvan a vuelta de correo en el sobre que aqui les enviamos y para el cual no necesitan sello.

Muchas gracias por su ayuda.

Sinceramente,

Simone Sternberg

Simone Sternberg

NPS
CRP

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Name of parent_____ School_____

Name of student_____ Grade_____

1. How many of your children presently attend the school indicated above?
   Circle one: 1 2 3 3+

2. In what grades are they enrolled?
   Circle grades: 1 2 3 4 5 6

3. How many of your children are enrolled in the special corrective reading program? 1 2 3 3+

4. In general, which of the following best describes your child's* interest towards corrective reading instruction? (Check one)
   _____ Very interested
   _____ Somewhat interested
   _____ Not at all interested
   Comment, if you desire:_____
   _____

5. Do you feel that your child* is benefiting from the corrective reading program? (Check one)
   _____ Greatly
   _____ Somewhat
   _____ Little
   Comment, if you desire:_____
   _____

6. Have you received any information about your child's* progress in the corrective reading program? (Check one)
   _____ Yes
   _____ No

   If yes, how was this information received? (Check all which apply)
   _____ Personal conference
   _____ Workshops
   _____ Group conference
   _____ Other; please specify_____

   If no, would you be interested in getting this information by way of (check one)
   _____ Workshops
   _____ Personal conference
   _____ Written report
   _____ Group conference
   _____ Other; please specify_____

Additional comments:

NPS
CRP

TEACHING & LEARNING

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE
(CUESTIONARIO PARA LOS PADRES)

Nombre del padre (o madre) _____

Nombre del estudiante _____

Escuela _____ Grado _____

1. Cuantos de sus hijos van a esta escuela? Circule el numero correcto.
   1 2 3 3+

2. En que grados estan matriculados? Circule los grados correctos.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

3. Cuantos de sus hijos estan matriculados en el "Special Corrective Reading Program", ("Programa Especial Para Mejorar Su Lectura") ?
   1 2 3 3+

4. Cual de las siquientes frases mejor describe el interes de su hijo* hacia el "Special Corrective Reading Program", ("Programa Especial Para Mejorar Su Lectura") ?
   _____ muy interesado
   _____ interesado
   _____ muy poco interes

   Comentario, si desea: _____
   _____

5. Cree Ud. que su hijo* se esta beneficiando con el "Corrective Reading Program", ("Programa Para Mejorar Su Lectura") ?
   _____ grandemente
   _____ poco
   _____ muy poco

   Comentario, si desea: _____
   _____

6. Ha recibido Ud. alguna informacion sobre el progreso de su hijo* en el "Corrective Reading Program", ("Programa Para Mejorar Su Lectura") ?
   _____ Si
   _____ No

   Si la respuesta es si, como recibio esta informacion?
   _____ en conferencia personal
   _____ en conferencia general
   _____ en conferencia con un grupo pequeño
   _____ de otra manera;(favor de especificar)_____

   Si la respuesta es no, como le interesaria recibir esta informacion? (marque una)
   _____ en conferencia general
   _____ en conferencia personal
   _____ reporte escrito
   _____ en conferencia con un grupo pequeño
   _____ de otra manera;(favor de especificar)_____

Comentarios adicionales:

* o hijos

APPENDIX H

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM

NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. If you were free to have any job you wanted after you finish school, which one would you most like to have?_____

2. Sometimes the job that a person wishes to have is not the one that he actually gets. What kind of a job do you think you really will get when you finish school? _____

Please circle the number in front of the statement which best answers the following questions:

3. If you could go as far as you wanted in school, how far would you like to go?

1. I'd quit right now.
2. I'd like to go to high school for a while.
3. I'd like to finish high school.
4. I'd like to go to secretarial or trade school.
5. I'd like to go to college for a while.
6. I'd like to finish college.

4. Sometimes what we would like to do is not the same as what we really do. How far in school do you expect you will really go?

1. I plan to quit as soon as I can.
2. I plan to go on to high school for a while.
3. I plan on graduating from high school.
4. I plan on going to secretarial or trade school.
5. I plan on going to college for a while.
6. I plan on graduating from college.

Name_____

School_____

Grade_____